

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 and 10 are pending in the application. The Examiner has now rejected Claims 1, 5-8, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lemaire et al.* (U.S. Patent Nos. 5,594,658 or 5,613,038), Claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lemaire* in view of *Klatt* ("Review of Text-To-Speech conversion for English"), Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lemaire* in view of *Klatt*, and further in view of *Marui* (U.S. Patent No. 4,959,850), and Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lemaire* in view of *Gerson* (U.S. Patent No. 4,870,686).

Additionally, the Examiner has made an unorthodox comment with regard to the claim of priority in the present application. More specifically, the Examiner states that "applicant(s) should check their filing receipts and/or the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system for the acknowledgement of their domestic priority or benefit claims (if any) under 35 USC 119(e), 120 or 121 (37 CFR 1.78)." While it is understood that an applicant has the ability to check information regarding an application using the PAIR system, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner acknowledge receipt of Korean Application No. 1998-7287, filed on April 5, 1999 with the present application, from which the present application claims priority, by appropriately filing out the Priority Section of the PTOL-326 form.

As indicated above, independent Claims 1, 5, and 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lemaire*. More specifically, in rejecting Claims 1 and 8, the Examiner cites column 1, lines 40-67 of *Lemaire* as teaching a hands free kit circuitry for transmitting a short message calling signal to a handset. However, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect.

The present invention, as recited in the claims of the present application, generally discloses an apparatus and method for synthesizing speech sounds in a six step process. More specifically, the present invention discloses that a handset generates an alarm signal upon receipt of a short message and transmits the signal to a hands free kit (step 1). If the handset receives a short message calling signal (step 4), the handset transmits the short message to the hands free kit (step 5). That is, if the hands free kit outputs the alarm signal (step 2) and a user inputs a voice command (step 3), the hands free kit generates the short message calling signal and outputs the signal to the handset. Finally, after the hands free kit receives the short message from the handset, the hands free kit synthesizes the short message (step 6).

However, in *Lemaire*, messages are continuously transmitted from a transmitter, which the Examiner is citing as an equivalent of the handset circuitry, to a receiver or group of receivers, which the Examiner is citing as an equivalent of the hands free kit circuitry. The receiver or receivers receive the broadcast signals and then save any message directed to them, based on a matching address, in order to play the messages when directed.

Therefore, as recited in Claims 1 and 8 of the present application, a short message calling signal is transmitted from the hands free kit circuitry to the handset circuitry, for requesting that the short message is to be sent to the hands free kit circuitry. More specifically, because the messages are not continuously broadcast from the handset circuitry to the hands free kit circuitry, as in *Lemaire*, in Claims 1 and 8, a short message calling signal is used. The short message calling signal is not disclosed in *Lemaire*, nor would it be obvious, as the messages are continuously broadcast to the receiver, making it unnecessary for the receiver to transmit a signal for requesting a message to the transmitter. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect in rejecting Claims 1 and 8 as being unpatentable over *Lemaire*, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Additionally, independent Claim 5 also recites transmitting a short message calling signal generated upon input by said user's voice command to said handset upon detecting said sound synthesis command. Accordingly, for the same reasons given above with regards to Claims 1 and 8, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect in rejecting Claim 5 as being unpatentable over *Lemaire*, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Without conceding the patentability *per se* of dependent Claims 2-4, 6-7, and 10, these claims are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective independent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 2-4, 6-7, and 10 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the pending claims, i.e. Claims 1-8 and 10, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484